



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,669	11/12/2003	Marc Alan Strand	71608-02	8310
40850	7590	11/22/2005	EXAMINER	
ERIC D. MIDDLEMAS EASTMAN CHEMICAL COMPANY P. O. BOX 511 KINGSPORT, TN 37662-5075			SZEKELY, PETER A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/706,669

Applicant(s)

STRAND ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Szekely

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-113 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-113 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/5/05, 10/3/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 11, 24, 41, 59, 79, 91 and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. The claims contain improper Markush language. When the last conjunction is “and”, proper Markush language has to be used, which is “selected from the group consisting of”. Always. Without exception. In the alternative, if the present construction is maintained, the last conjunction has to be changed to “or”. See M.P.E.P. 2173.05(h). Applicants’ argument about Example 20 of M.P.E.P. section AI-66 is not convincing because the cited Example has been deleted from the M.P.E.P. during the latest revision and furthermore section AI deals with PCT applications only. The rejection is maintained.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

Art Unit: 1714

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-113 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of copending Application No. 10/722,870. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the ingredients of the instant composition are claimed by the copending application. The Terminal Disclaimer submitted by applicants is acknowledged, however it cannot be accepted since it has not been signed by an attorney of record.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1-15, 17-43, 45-60, 62-79, 81-92, 94-108 and 110-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastman Chemical Company WO 99/47605, in view of Shih et al. 5,534,570, JP-4-117432 (for plasticizers) and Klatt et al. 6,538,054 or JP-2002-53740 (for flame retardants) and Kanno 5,998,005 (for lubricants).

Art Unit: 1714

8. Since the polyester in Eastman is identical in every respect to the polyester claimed by applicants, it is obvious that the glass transition temperatures are identical also. The rejection is maintained.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants are arguing against an anticipation rejection when the instant rejection is for obviousness. Eastman contains all the ingredients claimed by applicants. Since Eastman does not name the individual plasticizers, lubricants and flame-retardants or their concentrations, one of ordinary skill in the art would look in other patents for guidance. The secondary references list the plasticizers, lubricants and flame-retardants customarily used with polyesters. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art; at the time the invention was made, to select applicants ingredients from a list of equivalents. It is well known that benzoate plasticizers are high solvating liquids and thus very compatible with polymers. References can be combined not only for what they individually suggest but also for what they, taken as a whole, would suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References must be considered for all they disclose and must not be limited to their preferred embodiments or working examples. In re Mills, 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972). Also, it is not a requirement for a finding of obviousness that the motivation of one of ordinary skill in the art be the same as applicants' for making the composition. In re Kemps, 40 USPQ2d 1309, 1311 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The rejection is maintained.

Specification

10. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In paragraph 0048 texanol benzyl phthalate is mentioned. Texanol is not a chemical composition. It is a tradename. There cannot be any unexplained tradenames in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

11. The use of the trademark Texanol has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Generic terminology means identifying it as 2,2,3 trimethyl 1,4 pentenediol.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1714

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (571) 272-1124. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Peter Szekely
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

P.S.
11/16/05